<u>REMARKS</u>

The Undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of having a phone interview with him on July 24th, 2007. At box "g" the Interview Summary indicated an agreement with respect to the claims was not reached. But the interview summary's description of the substance of the interview said:

"Applicant's Representative proposed claim language to overcome the objection of claims 1, 4, and 29 and 35 USC rejection of claims 1, 4, and 29 (and all dependent upon claims). Examiner agreed that such language would overcome the previous objection and 35 USC 112 rejection of the above mentioned claims.   Applicant's Representative further argued the 35 USC 112 rejection of Claims 29 and 30 of which Examiner agreed to withdraw upon the receiving of an official response to the current office action including these arguments."

The undersigned assumes this means the Examiner has agreed to the arguments and responses made with regard to the objection to these claims 1,4, 29, and 30, discussed in the two paragraphs below that start with the words "Paragraph 4."

The undersigned assumes the examiner marked box "g" because the matters discussed in the interview did not remove all the objections to the claims because they did not discuss all objections to the claims.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action requested that the Abstract be amended. In response the abstract has been amended as suggested.

Paragraph 3a of the Office Action requested that "-" be removed from before claim numbers, individual paragraphs in the claims, and where it occurs in claim preambles. In response the undersigned has attempted to delete all of the objected-to occurrences of "-".

Paragraph 3b correctly pointed out that claim 3 should depend from claim 1, and it has been amended to do so.

Paragraph 3c suggested that "...on said screen to represent said string, which string bitmap is..." be replaced with "...on said screen to represent said string, the string bitmap is..." In response I have made the suggested change, but I have replaced the suggested "is" at the end of the quoted replacement language with "being" to prevent the quoted phrase starting after the common from being a separate clause. I presume this change is in harmony with the Examiner's intent.

Paragraph 3d requested that Claim 30 be made consistent with the fact that it depends from claim 29 which recites a "computer system" claim. In response, Claim 30 has been amended to recite a "computer system."

Paragraph 4 of the office action rejected claims 1, 4, and 29 because it alleged the phrase "subpixel-optimized font image" used in these claims does not have a sufficient antecedent basis in the phrase "subpixel-optimized images of character-font shape" as is clearly intended. In response, the objected to phrase has been amended to read "said subpixel-optimized character-font shape images." It is hoped this will make the previously intended antecedent basis more clear. Since there is no change in the intended antecedent phrase, this amendment should not alter the scope of the claim at all.

Paragraph 4, on page 4 of the Office Action, apparently rejected claim 29 as being indefinite because it allegedly is unclear if it is covering (1) a computer system/apparatus or (2) computer programming on readable-medium. It apparently rejected claim 30 because it depended from claim 29 and would thus inherit this allegedly indefinite language.

In response, the undersigned would like to point out that the, the wording of the claim 29's preamble makes it clear that it is claiming a "computer system," so it appears the claim makes it clear what it is reciting, i.e., a computer system.

Second, it is extremely common for computer system claims, like claim 29, to recite as elements a processor and a memory that stores programmed instructions, and to distinguish the claimed invention in part, or in total, by what those instructions cause the processor or system to do.

To illustrate just how common such claims are, the undersigned typed in the following search, "aclm/"computer readable memory,"" into the USPTO web sites advanced search page. Then he searched the most recent twelve of the 2028 patents returned by such search to see how often many of them included such a claim. To his surprise, an amazing one third of these twelve patents included one or more such claims. The following are examples (with underlining added for emphasis):

United States Patent number 7,249,121, issued to Bharat, et al., on July 24, 2007

> 19. <u>A system comprising: a server</u> connected to a network, the server receiving search queries from users via the network, <u>the server including</u>: <u>at least one processor</u>; and <u>a memory</u> operatively coupled to the processor, <u>the memory storing program instructions that when executed by the processor, cause the processor to</u>: <u>identify</u> a list of documents relating to the search query by matching individual search terms in the query to an index of a corpus; <u>generate</u> a plurality of multiword substrings from the query in which each of the substrings includes at least two words; <u>calculate</u>, for each of the generated substrings, a value relating to one or more documents of the identified list of documents that contain the generated substring; <u>and select</u> semantic units from the generated multiword substrings as semantic units that have calculated values above a predetermined threshold and in which semantic units that

overlap other substrings with a higher calculated value are discarded, the selected semantic units being stored in the memory.

United States Patent number 7,246,374, issued to Simon, et al., on July 17, 2007

27. An apparatus comprising: a bus; a processor coupled to the bus; and a memory, coupled to the bus, to store a plurality of instructions that are executed by the processor, wherein the plurality of instructions, when executed, cause the processor to, identify which of a plurality of objects are associated with which of a plurality of desktops, identify which of a plurality of processes are associated with which of the plurality of desktops, and restrict, based on desktop identifiers of the plurality of processes and desktop identifiers of the plurality of objects, the plurality of processes to accessing only objects which are either associated with the same desktop as the process or associated with no desktop, the desktop identifiers of the plurality of objects being included in security descriptors for the plurality of objects along with owner identifiers that identify owners of the plurality of objects and access control lists of the objects

United States Patent number 7,245,598, issued to Puig-Oses, et al., on July 17, 2007

1. An apparatus for controlling the operation of a quality feedback channel in a wireless communication system, comprising: a computer-readable memory element; and a processing element configured to execute a set of computer-executable instructions stored on the computer-readable memory element, the set of said instructions for: determining a channel quality value associated with a transmission channel; determining a condition of the transmission channel; if the transmission channel condition is favorable, then transmitting the channel quality value over one slot of the channel quality feedback channel, wherein the condition of the transmission channel is determined to be favorable by comparing energy levels of symbols received on the transmission channel to a predetermined threshold amount; if the channel

condition is not favorable, then <u>transmitting</u> the channel quality value over a plurality of slots of the channel quality feedback channel; and <u>determining</u> a transmission rate of the channel quality value over the feedback channel based on the condition of the transmission channel.

United States Patent number 7,243,276, issued to Norris, et al., on July 10, 2007

13. A <u>computer system comprising</u> a <u>processor</u>, an address/data bus coupled to said processor, and a <u>computer-readable memory</u> unit adapted to coupled to said processor, said <u>memory unit containing instructions that when executed by said processor implement a method, said method comprising</u> the computer implemented steps of, in the order recited: <u>(a) placing</u> a DDR DRAM having a test mode and an operational mode in test mode, said DDR RAM comprising an array of storage cells arranged in rows and columns, storage cells each row addressable by a respective wordline of a set of wordlines and each storage cells in each column addressable by a respective bitline of a set of bitlines; <u>(b) issuing</u> a bank activate command on an occurrence of a rising edge of a first clock signal of a pair of adjacent clock signals of a test clock to select and bring up a wordline selected from said set of wordlines for write of said wordline selected for write; <u>(c) issuing</u> a write with auto-precharge command on an occurrence of a rising edge of a second clock signal of said pair of adjacent clock signals to write a test pattern to storage cells corresponding to said wordline selected for write; (d) repeating steps (b) and (c) until all wordlines of said set of wordlines have been selected and written; <u>(e) issuing</u> a bank activate command on an occurrence of a rising edge of a first clock signal of a subsequent pair of adjacent clock signals to select and bring up a wordline selected from said set of wordlines for read of said wordline selected for read; <u>(f) issuing</u> a read with auto-precharge command on an occurrence of a rising edge of a second clock signal of said subsequent pair of adjacent clock signals to read the stored test pattern from storage cells corresponding to said wordline

selected for read; and (g) repeating steps (e) and (f) until all wordlines of said set of wordlines have been selected and read.

If this sampling of 12 most recently issued patents that met the search terms in July of 2007 is at all representative of the other 2028 that did, it would indicate that roughly at least 2028/3 or 673 U.S. patents have issued with such language like that being objected to. In fact the actual number is probably considerably larger, because this sample only included claims that used the exact phrase "computer readable memory." Many other claims with the same basic form might refer to "electronic memory", "machine readable memory," or program instructions recorded in memory, or any other of the many other ways in which a claim of this basic form could be worded. Thus, it appears the USPTO is currently issuing a large number of claims that, like Claim 29, recite a computer system with a computer readable memory storing instructions and that distinguishes all or part of the invention in terms of what those instructions cause the system to do. This being the case, it appears that Paragraph 4's rejection of claim 29 is improper.

A third reason why the rejection of claim 29 in Paragraph 4 appears improper, is because there does not seem to be anything wrong with the fact that the a computer system/apparatus claim is in part defined by the type of instructions stored in its computer readable memory. A claim for a machine is not made indefinite because it recite distinguishing limitations in terms of a particular composition of matter, manufacture, or step or process performed by its various elements or means, even though these distinctions, if taken separate would fall into different categories of invention. A claim for a computer-readable memory is not made indefinite because it is distinguished by the functions its instructions cause a processor to perform, even though those steps taken by themselves would fall into the category of process claims. Thus, there is no reason why a computer system that includes such a memory should be rendered indefinite because it is at least or totally distinguished by the functions its instructions cause a processor to perform.

A fourth reason is that it is not clear that a computer readable memory is a different class of invention than a computer system. Although one could consider a manufacture,

such as a CD-ROM to be a computer readable memory, a computer readable memory, particularly when recited as part of a computer system often includes apparatuses, such as disk drives, CD or DVD drives, electronic memories, and other types of apparatuses. In fact, a computer readable memory claim defined by the function of the programming it stores appears to be patentable whether the claim covers manufactures, apparatuses, or both.

And fifth, it is not clear, at least to the undersigned, how the language Paragraph 4 suggested for fixing the alleged problem in any way removes the characteristics of the claim at are allegedly improper.

For all these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 29 is improper, and that both claim 29, and claim 30 which depends from it, are patentable.

Please note Claims 1, 4, and 29 have been amended to insert the omitted the plural ending to the word "shape" the antecedent phrase "subpixel-optimized images of character-font shape" discussed above, and to delete the words "because they are," which appear unnecessary.

Paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office action says that in response to the applicants arguments of 6/26/06 the objection to claim 15 and the rejections to claims 1, 3-18, and 29 based on prior art have been withdrawn. The undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for the withdrawal of this objection and these rejections.

It is hoped that since the basis for rejection of these claims set forth in the Office Action appear to have been overcome, that claims 1, 3-18, and 29 are allowable. Since claim 30 depends from claim 29 it is hoped it is allowable, and since Claim 31 depends from claim 1, it is hoped it is also allowable. The Office Action indicates that claims 32-39 are only objected to. Since it appears this amendment removes all the bases for the objection to those claims it is hoped that they also are allowable.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action said that it did not find the arguments of the 6/26/06 amendment persuasive. Apparently this only means the correction of the abstract made in the 6/26/06 amendment was not satisfactory. It is hoped that the above amendment to the abstract will remove any such problem.

An Information Disclosure Statement has been filed by express mail earlier today. It is not being eFiled because it contains some non-US patent references.

It is respectfully submitted that with the above amendments all of the currently pending claims, that is claims 1, 3-18 and 29-39 are patentable and early allowance of these claims is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Edward W. Porter/

Edward W. Porter
Registration No.28,892
Porter & Associates
24 String Bridge S12
Exeter, NH 03833
(617) 494[[-]]1722